

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed on September 30, 2005, in which claims 1-12 were rejected by the Examiner. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the above amendments, are believed to render all claims at issue patentable over the cited references.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 8 and 9, and added a new claim 21 according to the description on page 5, lines 20-21, of the claimed invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 13-20 are canceled and are being filed in a divisional application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 & § 103

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al (US 6,562,217). Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al (US 6,562,217) in view of Hamamoto et al (US 6,800,836 B2).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections by the Examiner for the reasons discussed below.

Regarding amended Claim 1 of the claimed invention, a package of a semiconductor device with a flexible wiring substrate according to the claimed invention comprises a semiconductor substrate and a plate, the semiconductor device and at least one pad are on a surface of the semiconductor substrate, the plate is located above the surface of the semiconductor substrate, the

semiconductor device is covered by the plate, the pad is uncovered by the plate, and the flexible wiring substrate having at least one contact section is electrically connected with a bump bonded to the pad by an adhesive layer.

In the claimed invention, the plate is used to protect the semiconductor device from being damaged by airborne dust or other particles, and the flexible wiring substrate can be directly attached onto the semiconductor substrate easily because “the pad is uncovered by the plate”, i.e. the flexible wiring substrate could be attached onto the semiconductor substrate without being obstructed by the plate.

In the cited ‘217 reference, the substrate (flexible wiring substrate) is used as the plate of the claimed invention to cover both the IC chip (having a semiconductor device) and the aluminum electrode (pad), which is different from the claimed invention. In addition, the cited ‘836 reference does not disclose a feature “the pad is uncovered by the plate” of the claimed invention.

It is therefore Applicant’s belief that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Insofar as claims 2-12 and 21 depend from claim 1, it is Applicant’s belief that these claims are also allowable.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion


In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-12, and 21 as currently presented are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including

extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP



Benjamin A. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: December 30, 2005
BJH/jk